

<i>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</i>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/938,013	NGUYEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Gary Jones	1634	

Applicant(s)

NGUYEN ET AL.

Art Unit

1634

Status of Application: *After final Rejection*

(3) Khue Vu Nguyen.

(4) Mai Nguyen.

Time: 2:00 PM. EST

☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Part I.

Claims discussed:
Claim 1

Prior art documents discussed:
Jong et al., Lefebvre et al., Feuerstein et al., Powell, Gruber et al. and Bruce

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of rejections discussed: 35USC103
35USC112 1st Paragraph
35USC112 2nd Paragraph.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Dr. Nguyen discussed the qualitative method used in the instant diagnostic method. MR. Jones and Ms Goldberg pointed out the the invention as claimed failed to define and unobvious improvement over the prior art. It was agreed that the claim suggested in the final rejection would overcome the new matter and indefiniteness rejections. The the particular quantity should be supplied to the last sentence of the suggested claim to distinguish over the prior art. .